The reading states that there are some different methods which can be used to prevent the problem of frog populations’ decreasing. The lecturer, however, finds all the methods proposed by reading passage dubious and rejects all of them.

First of all, the author argues that pesticides are chemicals which profoundly affect frogs and can cause many breathing problems for them, and as a result, their population would start to decrease. If some laws are set to ban farmers from using pesticides, frogs will secure from population decline. On the contrary, the lecturer brings up the fact that this strategy definitely is not economical for farmers. They heavily rely on pesticides and if they are forced to stop using pesticides, they can not compete with other farmers, and probably they would gain much lower product compared to the others.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that fungus is one of the major causes of the frog population declining because they cause thickening of the frogs’ skin. As a result, frogs can not absorb water like before and also cause infection. By treating frogs, we can eradicate fungus, and frogs can continue their lives. Conversely, the lecturer mentions that such a treatment program needs to bring all of the frogs and treat them individually. Such activity obviously is not practical. Besides, such treatments can not prevent infection from passing through the genes, and as a result, these programs should run continually. It is obvious that this kind of program can be much expensive.

Finally, the reading mentions that water habitats in which frogs live and reproduce should be preserved carefully, so frogs can easily survive. On the other hand, the lecturer dismisses this method and mentions the fact that the most important factor in frog population declining is global warming, so preventing people from using waters can not be beneficial and does not affect the frog population.